

MINUTES

SALINA CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
CITY COMMISSION ROOM
May 2, 2006 4:00 PM

MEMBERS

PRESENT: Bonilla-Baker, Ritter, Simpson, Soderberg, and
Yarnevich

MEMBERS

ABSENT: Funk, Schneider, Mikesell and Weisel

DEPARTMENT STAFF: Andrew, Burger, Herrs, Jeanfreau, Nelson and Johnson

Item #1. Approval of the minutes of the regular meeting held on April 4, 2006.

The minutes of the April 4, 2006 meeting were approved as presented.

Mr. Andrew introduced Dustin Herrs, the City's new Assistant Planner.

Item #2. Status report on implementation of EPA's NPDES (National Pollution Discharge Elimination System) more commonly known as Phase II of the Stormwater Program – Public Works Department.

Mr. Andrew reported that the City of Salina is gradually phasing in the implementation of EPA's stormwater discharge regulations and staff wants to provide the Commission with some information about upcoming changes in the way development of land is regulated.

Mr. Johnson introduced Wayne Nelson, Civil Engineer, who gave a PowerPoint presentation on stormwater pollution and erosion control.

Item #3. Consider initiation of zoning text amendments relating to signs, accessory apartments and demolition of landmarks and contributing structures in historic districts.

Mr. Andrew discussed three possible amendments to the Zoning Ordinance.

Mrs. Soderberg asked this says one sign?

Mr. Andrew stated yes.

Mrs. Soderberg asked then how did the property on Ohio get two?

Mr. Andrew stated because when we turned down the request to have two signs it was brought to our attention that if you read the fine print in the overall sign standards and read those two sections together that essentially the language is clear, it pretty clearly says if you are on a corner lot and you have a numerical limit you can double the number of signs. It doesn't allow you to double the square footage of signs because that is taken care of already in the ordinance because your signage is based on the frontage you have on the street and if you have two frontages you get more signage but quite honestly everybody who has administered sign permits has focused on what zoning district you're in and what that district allows and so the ordinance is not very well constructed because the sections don't relate to each other but if you sit down and read the two together you can't help but conclude that you have the ability to have two ground signs but I can say that in 20 years nobody has interpreted it that way but now it is being interpreted that way so that is why it is an issue now even though the ordinance is 20 years old.

Mrs. Soderberg asked will there be any kind of moratorium since we are going to take this up? Will people come back now once they see that?

Mr. Andrew stated I think one reason that it has never been an issue before is that

nobody has ever wanted to put up two signs before. This was a case of miscommunication where we believed that we had communicated early in the process that one sign was permitted but it was felt by the owner that because it was a corner and there are traffic signal boxes and all that one sign wouldn't be sufficient to provide coverage or identification on both frontages. That is a possibility, but one of the reasons we are acting on this real quickly is to get that in front of you and get your recommendation on what direction we should go.

Mr. Andrew continued with his staff report.

Mr. Simpson stated would the Commission like to see that historic district amendment proceed?

MOTION: Mrs. Yarnevich stated sure. I move that we (the Commission) authorize staff to look into the text amendment and bring it back to the Commission for review.

Mr. Simpson asked is there a second?

SECOND: Mr. Ritter.

VOTE: Motion carried (5-0).

Mr. Andrew stated what we have to do on any text amendment is to first file it, then publicly advertise it and what hearing date that it will be considered so that people have an opportunity to view it in advance and come to the hearing if they have any comments on that so that's the process we would look at. Any text amendment probably couldn't be considered until June because we have to give people notice and an opportunity to review that before that takes place so we will move forward with that and provide you with a lot more background information at that time, probably the first meeting in June.

Mr. Simpson asked any other matters Dean?

Item #5. Other matters.

Mr. Andrew stated we do have a meeting scheduled for the 16th and we do have two cases filed. One is a rezoning over on Prospect and then there's a Conditional Use Permit application, the St. John's Military School is seeking permission or approval to relocate their football field, their athletic fields across from their campus to the north side of Euclid which would be the area north of the school between there and the flood control levee. They have acquired some property there. They are thinking that maybe they have higher and better uses of their campus space there and they are looking at that relocation, so a Conditional Use Permit would have to be reviewed to evaluate what impact that would have, parking, lighting and things of that nature so that will be on your agenda for the 16th.

Mr. Simpson asked anything else?

Mr. Andrew stated that is all we have for you this afternoon.

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 4:58 p.m.



Dean Andrew, Secretary

ATTEST: _____